

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-11, 13, and 14 are amended. New claim 16 is presented. No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims and new claim are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Independent claims 1, 6, and 11 are amended to recite, respectively, a noise determination method, a noise countermeasure determination apparatus, and a computer-readable medium, using claim 1 as an example "for determining a noise countermeasure with respect to an analyzing circuit that is to be analyzed and is categorizable into a plurality of transmission circuit topologies depending on manners in which wirings are connected, wherein a transmission waveform of the analyzing circuit differs depending on each of the transmission circuit topologies." (See, for example, FIGS. 27-37 and page 48, lines 14-32).

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-10, 13, and 14 are amended accordingly.

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

ITEMS 11-29: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-15 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AS ANTICIPATED BY TSUCHIDA (U.S.P. 5,559,997)

The Examiner rejects independent claims 1, 6, and 11 (and respective dependent claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12-15) as anticipated by Tsuchida

Features Not Taught By Tsuchida

Independent claims 1, 6, and 11, all as amended, recite respectively, a noise determination method, a noise countermeasure determination apparatus, and a computer-readable medium, using claim 1 as an example, "for determining a noise countermeasure with respect to an analyzing circuit that is to be analyzed and is categorizable into a plurality of transmission circuit topologies depending on manners in which wirings are connected, wherein a transmission waveform of the analyzing circuit differs depending on each of the transmission circuit topologies comprising -obtaining an analyzing circuit judgement result by judging acceptability of the analyzing circuit based on a comparison of features of the analyzing circuit and the transmission circuit topologies; and outputting an improvement proposal for making the analyzing circuit closer to one of basic types of the transmission circuit topologies depending on the analyzing circuit judgement result."

As provided in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that the reference must teach every aspect of a claimed invention.

Applicants submit that Tsuchida does not support an anticipatory-type rejection by not describing features recited in independent claims 1, 6, and 11 (and respective dependent claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12-15).

According to aspects of the present invention, a noise countermeasure is determined with respect to an analyzing circuit that is to be analyzed and is categorizable into a plurality of transmission circuit topologies depending on manners in which wirings are connected, wherein a transmission waveform of the analyzing circuit differs depending on each of the transmission circuit topologies. (See, for example, FIGS. 27-37 and page 48, lines 14-32).

Accordingly, according to aspects of the present invention, automatic selection of an improvement proposal for the analyzing circuit is possible. Further, such a selection of an optimum improvement proposal is possible within a short processing time regardless of a degree of skill of the user. (See, for example, page 6, lines 26-33 and page 9, line 35 to page 11, line 6).

The Examiner mistakenly contends that features recited by claims 1-15 are taught by Tsuchida's "addition of noise reduction component", "rated value change", "all 25 changeable parts" and "simulation" as illustrated in FIG. 1. (Action at pages 2-3).

Tsuchida does not teach obtaining an analyzing circuit judgement "based on a comparison of features of the analyzing circuit and the transmission circuit topologies."

Further, Tsuchida does not teach outputting "an improvement proposal making the analyzing circuit closer to one of basic types of the transmission circuit topologies depending on the analyzing circuit judgement result."

Rather, Tsuchida merely teaches (see, for example, col. 1, starting at line 10 for example in FIG. 1) adding a noise reduction component (noise countermeasures) to the circuit design data, and repeating a simulation with a change of parameters if a simulation result differs from an anticipated result.

Summary

Since Tsuchida does not describe features recited in independent claims 1, 6, and 11 (and respective dependent claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12-15), the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-15 allowed.

NEW CLAIM

New claim 16 is presented to recite features of the present invention in a different fashion.

New claim 16 recites a method for determining noise countermeasure including "categorizing an analyzing circuit into a plurality of transmission circuit wiring topologies, wherein a transmission waveform of the analyzing circuit differs depending on each of the topologies; comparing the topologies; and outputting an noise countermeasure improvement proposal based on the comparison."

These features of claim 16 patentably distinguish over the cited art, and claim 16 is submitted to be allowable for the recitations therein.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 27, 2005

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501